

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

I am deeply concerned that an election could be hijacked by a powerful media company that doesn't seem to realize it is accountable to the citizenry. The impact of something like the "Stolen Honor" propaganda piece could be enough in "battleground areas" to sway enough uninformed voters to affect a national election. Is this right? Is this in the best interests of this nation? I sincerely doubt it!

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.